

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action of 2 April 2007. In response to the Office Action, Applicant has Amended Figures 1A-1C and 2, amended the specification, amended the claims, and makes the following remarks.

Information Disclosure Statement

Along with this response, Applicant is filing an information disclosure statement and a request for continued examination to have the references indicated therein examined.

Objection to the Specification

Examiner has indicated that the disclosure is objected to because of an informality in paragraph 0020 where “element 46” is referred to as a “numerically controlled counter (NCO)” where NCO is known in the art as a numerically controlled oscillator. Applicant has amended this paragraph such that “counter” is replaced with “oscillator”. Further, Applicant believes that no new matter is introduced because NCO is known in the art as a numerically known oscillator, and one having ordinary skill in the art would know that a numerically controlled oscillator is interchangeable with a numerically controlled counter.

Objection to the Claims

Examiner has objected to the claims on several grounds. Examiner objects to claim 1 because “lines 4-8 do not appear to be an apparatus-type limitations” where “the preamble is directed to a system,” and Examiner suggests “line 4 should start by reciting the actual hardware of the system configured to generate the ‘encoded time signal.’” Applicant is unaware of any requirement that system claims must be limited to hardware. Nevertheless, Applicant has amended claim 1 such that the first element is “an externally generated encoded time signal input”. Applicant sets forth that the claims as amended particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Examiner further objects to claim 1 because the claim uses the terms “encoded time signal” and “externally generated encoded time signal”. Applicant has amended claims 1, 9, and 12 to overcome this objection.

Examiner further objects to the claims because “[a] goal to ‘sampling of analog signal inputs’ / ‘synchronous operation’ is set forth in the preamble, however, the body of the claim does not include any limitation(s) to ‘synchronous sampling of analog inputs’ or ‘synchronous operation’”. Again, Applicant is unaware of any such requirement for claims. Further, Applicant suggests that the “goal” is addressed in the last element of claim 1 in “producing an output sampling synchronization signal”. The same reply applies to claims 9 and 12, as appropriate. Applicant kindly traverses Examiner’s objection.

Further, Examiner has objected to claims 2, 10, and 13 because the term IRIG-B “should be expanded”. Applicant is unaware of any requirement that acronyms in claims must be “expanded”. Applicant puts forth that the acronym “IRIG-B” is well known in the art as “inter-range instrumentation group” standard “B”. Further, according to MPEP §2111.01, claim terms are to be given their “plain meaning” unless Applicant has provided a clear definition in the specification, where “plain meaning” refers to the ordinary and customary meaning given to the term by those of ordinary skill in the art. Because applicant is unaware of any requirement that all acronyms in claims be expanded, and “IRIG-B” is to be given its “plain meaning,” Applicant respectfully traverses Examiner’s objection.

Examiner further objects to claim 7, and suggests deleting “code” from claim 7 line 1. Applicant has amended claim 7 in accordance with Examiner’s suggestion.

Finally, Examiner has objected to claim 12, suggesting that “synchronization” be inserted after “sampling” in lines 11-14 “to be consistent with the specification”. Applicant has amended claim 12 in accordance with Examiner’s suggestion.

Applicant believes that no new matter is introduced with the above amendments.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that in light of the arguments set forth in this response, this application is now in condition for allowance, and requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued. However, should Examiner be of the opinion that further amendments or response is required, Applicant encourages Examiner to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below. Further, although no additional fees are believed to be due at this time, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees or deficiencies or credit any overpayments to Cook, Alex, McFarron, Manzo, Cummings & Mehler, Ltd., Deposit

Appl. No. 10/645,418

Reply to Office Action of 2 April 2007

Account No. 50-1039 with reference to attorney docket number (1444-0083).

Respectfully submitted,

COOK, ALEX, McFARRON, MANZO,
CUMMINGS & MEHLER, LTD.

By: 
David Mundt, Reg. No. 41,207

200 West Adams Street
Suite 2850
Chicago, Illinois 60606
(312) 984-0144 (Telephone)
(312) 984-0146 (Facsimile)